

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 2, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US 5,510,956) in view of Hawke et al. (US 5,528,457).

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hawke et al. and Fortin et al. (US 6,739,497).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (US 5,977,626) in view of Hawke et al.

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hawke et al.

### **Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant amends claim 1 to further define the invention, and cancels claims 5 and 6. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 are currently pending.

### **All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1, 2, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US 5,510,956) in view of Hawke et al., claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hawke et al. and Fortin et al. (US 6,739,497), claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (US 5,977,626) in view of Hawke et al., and claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hawke et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2, 4, and 7.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a high-density chip scale package including, in part, “a liquid encapsulant filled in the space defined between the die and the printed circuit board,” wherein “the die includes a plurality of solder balls formed at the bottom surface thereof so that the die is electrically connected to the printed circuit board by means of the solder balls.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of Suzuki, Hawke et al., Fortin et al., and Wang et al., whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest a high-density chip scale package including, in part, “a liquid encapsulant filled in the space defined between the die and the printed circuit board,” wherein “the die includes a plurality of solder balls formed at the bottom surface thereof so that the die is electrically connected to the printed circuit board by means of the solder balls,” as required by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2, 4, and 7.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of Suzuki, Hawke et al., Fortin et al., and Wang et al., whether taken single or combined, teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2, 4, and 7. Thus, Applicant respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) be withdrawn.


### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By:   
David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: December 2, 2005

**Customer No.: 009629**  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202.739.3000  
Facsimile: 202.739.3001